

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are all the claims pending in the application.

In accordance with the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3 and 6-8 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments is found in the specification in at least paragraph [44]. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:**

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Claims 1-5, 11, and 13**

The Examiner alleges that claim 1 is unclear because “Claims 1 lines 3-4 state: a packet memory management unit for assembling the first data into an Internet Protocol (IP) packet and loading the IP packet into a packet memory. While, line 11 states: the IP packet trailer being read from the packet memory management unit.”

In order to assist the Examiner’s understanding, reference is made to non-limiting exemplary embodiments of the present invention, in which a packet memory management unit 400 includes a packet memory 490 (*see* FIG. 1 and FIG. 4), and an IP packet comprising a packet header A1, a packet trailer A2, and a packet trailer A3 are stored in the packet memory 490 (*see* FIG. 8). In view of the above, it is clearly shown that the stored packet may include the packet trailer, and a packet memory is included in the packet memory management unit.

Applicant amends “the IP packet trailer being read from the packet memory management unit” recited in line 11 of claim 1 to read “the IP packet trailer being read from the packet memory of the packet memory management unit.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 1 are earnestly solicited. Reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 2-5, 11 and 13 are also earnestly solicited for at least their dependencies on claim 1.

**Claim 2**

The Examiner alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in line 7 of claim 2, “the pointer of the IP packet header.” Applicant amends “the pointer of the IP packet header” recited in line 11 of claim 2 to read “a pointer of the IP packet header.”

The Examiner also alleges that it is unclear as to why the limitation “IP packet trailer” is being repeated in lines 11-12 of claim 2. Applicant amends “transmitting the pointers of the IP packet trailer and the IP packet trailer to the header processing unit” recited in claim 2 to read “transmitting the pointer of the IP packet trailer and the IP packet header to the header processing unit.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 2 are earnestly solicited.

**Claim 6**

The Examiner alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in line 8 of claim 6, “the packet memory management unit.” Applicant amends “the packet memory management unit” recited in claim 6 to read “a packet memory management unit.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with regard to claim 6 are earnestly solicited.

**Claims 7-10, 12 and 14**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with regard to claims 7-10, 12, and 14 are earnestly solicited for at least their dependencies on claim 6.

**Claim 7**

The Examiner alleges that it is unclear as to why the limitation “IP packet trailer” is being repeated in lines 7-8 of claim 7. Applicant amends “transmitting the pointers of the IP packet trailer and the IP packet trailer to the header processing step” recited in claim 7 to read “transmitting the pointer of the IP packet trailer and the IP packet header to the header processing step.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 7 are earnestly solicited.

**In addition, amendments made to claims 1-3 and 6-8 are to improve clarity.**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,  
/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

S. Stuart Lee  
Registration No. 61,124

Date: July 8, 2009